



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ican outposts on the slope to the north of the "Hollow Way," now Manhattan Street, boldly advancing and driving back the British outposts on the heights south of that depression till their further advance was checked by the British reinforcements which hurried to the scene of action. The Americans then retired to the main body of their army. The real importance of this successful skirmish lies in the fact that it evidently raised General Howe's estimate of the fighting powers of the American army, and led him to avoid attacking it in a pitched battle on the northern end of Manhattan Island. He preferred to outflank Washington by moving the larger part of his army up the Sound and landing it near New Rochelle, thereby compelling Washington to withdraw most of his army from Manhattan Island, and to move inland toward White Plains, where the two armies met in battle on October 28.

The effect of the victory at Harlem upon the American leaders explains their plans for the subsequent campaign. It raised their hopes of successfully resisting the royal troops, and largely influenced Washington to leave a garrison of 2,500 men in Fort Washington and the neighboring redoubts, while he retired northward with the main army to White Plains. The easy capture of Fort Washington by the British about a month later showed how seriously Washington had overestimated its strength and underestimated the aggressive power of Howe's army. In a word, the battle of Harlem, with the movements before and after, illustrates well the general success and the one distinct failure of Washington's generalship, the former in avoiding being crushed by an enemy who outnumbered him and skillfully withdrawing his army to more inaccessible points; the latter by allowing himself to be persuaded to separate his army and leave a considerable body to certain capture at Fort Washington, the loss of whom, at that time, was a most serious injury to the American cause.

J. C. SCHWAB.

*The Westward Movement.* The Colonies and the Republic West of the Alleghanies, 1763-1798. With full cartographical Illustrations from contemporary Sources. By JUSTIN WINSOR. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1897. Pp. viii, 595.)

THIS, the last contribution of Justin Winsor to history, is monumental in its erudition and is a work of the highest importance to students of the beginnings of the West. In a volume of nearly six hundred pages, every page resembling a frontiersman in its sinewy freedom from anything like superfluous flesh, the author has traced the westward advance from the close of the French and Indian war in 1763 to the last years of the eighteenth century. It is unnecessary to point out that these were years full of events in western history. They include the development of the policy of Great Britain in respect to the West, after the expulsion of France; the exploration and settlement of Kentucky and Tennessee;

Lord Dunmore's war and the Revolutionary war beyond the mountains, including the memorable conquest of the Northwest by George Rogers Clark; the intrigues of France and Spain to restrict us at the peace to the Alleghany and Ohio boundaries; the British policy in the retention of the western posts and in respect to the Indians; the Ordinance of 1787 and the settlement of Ohio, with the accompanying Indian struggles; the efforts of Spain to hold the Southwest and to exclude the frontiersmen from the navigation of the Mississippi; her attempts to seduce the frontier leaders from their American allegiance; the attempts at independent states in Kentucky and eastern Tennessee; the efforts of Genet to use the Kentucky backwoodsmen in an attempt to seize Louisiana for France; the securing of the Northwest by Jay's treaty and Wayne's victories, and the acquisition of freedom of the Mississippi by Pinckney's treaty. On all these topics Mr. Winsor is full of information.

Every one of these subjects bristles with historical difficulties. They have been studied by special students in extended works; but it is safe to say that never before has the whole field been surveyed with more minute care. Mr. Roosevelt has covered substantially the period in nearly four volumes, or about eleven hundred pages. The aims of the two writers and their ideals are, however, in clear contrast. Mr. Roosevelt is mainly interested in the manners, customs and institutions of the frontiersmen, and in the campaigns of their great leaders. He gives a flowing and picturesque narrative of the movements of the backwoodsmen, with generalizations on the relations of these movements to world-history. He makes a large use of the manuscript material for his subject in American collections, and he is little concerned with the events in Congress and in the back country of the Middle States. Mr. Winsor was, on the other hand, first of all the librarian, keenly and critically searching the printed works for separate items of historical information in the whole field. For example, his treatment of the Revolution in the West, in contrast with that of Mr. Roosevelt, shows the wider range of Mr. Winsor's treatment of the subject. He loved an abundance of facts, and he knew the uses of the card catalogue. He lacked the artistic instinct, he was wanting in that historical imagination which fuses the separate elements of historical knowledge into a single and pleasing presentation; his classified cards are always in sight. The result is that Mr. Winsor's work is a thesaurus of events for the student, rather than a history for the general reader. His work is essentially monographic, and yet by a most regrettable policy, Mr. Winsor, librarian though he was, has omitted, except in the rarest cases, to cite the authorities for his statements. It is true that where every page teems with historical facts, drawn from a wide variety of sources, such citation would be particularly cumbrous; and yet, by omitting them, he deprives those readers, whose needs the work is best fitted to serve, of the means of using his material, of testing his statements, and of reaching satisfactory conclusions regarding the relative contributions of the author himself.

In a work of this nature there is little to be said of the general historical conclusions of the author; the criticism must relate rather to the

correctness of his specific statements. At the same time, it must be said that the grouping furnished by the separate chapter-headings reveals a system and a sweep of view that show that Mr. Winsor might, with a different policy, have elaborated his conception of the westward advance into a philosophy of the movement. He prefers to allow his classified events to tell their own story; and it is important to note that it is events rather than institutions or ideals that he considers.

The work gives some indications that the author's final revision, of style particularly, was not as complete as he no doubt would have wished to make it. In illustration, it may be pointed out that his sentences sometimes say the opposite thing from that which he intended. In writing of the "growing influence of the anti-Quaker element in the province" of Pennsylvania, he says, "It was to this latter conservative and sluggish faction that the Germans mainly adhered" (page 12). Speaking of slavery he says (page 289), "Jefferson's preliminary ordinance of 1784 *had* rooted it out of every part of the trans-Alleghany region, though this section had received only the vote of six states when seven were required." It is misleading to use the words "preliminary ordinance" of Jefferson's draft (which, by the way, was not to go into effect until 1800), and although the careful reader will see that the intention is to say that the draft was changed, yet the words do not convey that meaning. Other examples of loose expression are the following: "Jay, who had been chosen minister to Spain (October 4), to enforce its claim to the Mississippi." On page 201, the careless use of the pronoun "they" gives the impression that a large party was ready to yield western New York, and in general the region beyond the Alleghanies, on the demand of France and Spain, at the close of the Revolution. Fortunately he cites here his authority, a proposition of Gouverneur Morris, who was well known as an opponent to western ideas.

At times, Mr. Winsor seems to attribute to the pioneers motives, based upon events in the East, for which there is not sufficient evidence. His work in connecting the eastern and western influences upon particular events is valuable, but it is overdoing the matter to say (p. 7), "The immediate struggle over the Stamp Act, which was closed by its repeal in 1766, produced, for a time at least, that political quiet which induces enterprise. The attention of the pioneers was again drawn to the western movement." A writer more familiar with the spirit of the backwoodsman would not have made that statement. Nor is it easy to see how Mr. Winsor, after the attention which he has given to the influence of the fur-trader in Canadian policy, could regard the extension of the boundaries of Quebec by the well known act as directed by an ulterior aim, to which the needs of the fur-trade served merely as a cloak. The Canadian archives as studied by Professor Coffin, in his monograph on *The Quebec Act and the American Revolution*, show how important the Indian trade was considered by the British officials in their correspondence on this topic. One of the most curious illustrations of the author's apparent lack of understanding of the fur-trade occurs in his discussion of the

boundaries provided by the treaty of 1783. He describes the boundary on the northwest as in part the Grand Portage (pp. 220, 239), when in fact, it was precisely because the Grand Portage was, by a British misconception, no doubt, left wholly within the limits of the United States, that the Canadian traders were so discontented with the limits. Perhaps this, as much as any single element, sharpened the traders' appeals to the home government which were so influential in inducing Great Britain to retain the western posts. For a cartographer of Mr. Winsor's ability, this is a remarkable misunderstanding. Similar slips may be instanced in his treatment of the projects for cutting the West into new states. He confuses at times the petitions of the people of West Virginia proper, with the petitions from Kentucky and from the State of Franklin (pp. 245, 341). In his account of the Ordinance of 1784 he attributes to Jefferson the intention to make fourteen states in the West, adding territory south of the 35th parallel and east of the falls of the Ohio to South Carolina and Georgia (page 258). But the evidence for this probably rests on the letter of Congressman David Howell, not cited, and Howell gives his own interpretation. It is not unlikely that Jefferson favored this adjustment of boundaries, but his plan does not warrant Mr. Winsor's statement. It is possible that Mr. Winsor relies on the contemporaneous map given opposite the page of the text cited, which he describes as showing "the proposed divisions of the western territory under Jefferson's ordinance of 1784, with the caution that "Franklin is misplaced." But not only is Franklin misplaced, the boundary meridians are completely wrong, and the map is as deceptive as could well be. If any errors in it were to be pointed out, these should also have been.

The Ordinance of 1787 receives considerable attention in the volume. Mr. Winsor is not impressed with its effect upon the destiny of the Northwest; he finds the real exclusion of slavery from that region rather due to "the constancy of a later generation" than to "an ordinance which was never in its entire provisions effective, which had been annulled by the adoption of the Constitution and substantially re-enacted by the first Congress." But in compensation for this attitude he attributes to the Ordinance an important effect upon the Constitutional Convention. As the view appears to be original, it is well to present it in Mr. Winsor's words:

"The federal convention, just at this time sitting in Philadelphia, was seeking to find a way out of a dismal political environment. It needed, in one aspect, the encouragement of just the outcome which a copy of the perfected ordinance, as printed in a Philadelphia newspaper on July 25, afforded. The bold assumption of Congress to regulate the public domain was a stroke which helped the convention better to understand the relations of the states to the unorganized territory in the West. The enlarged condition which the new ordinance gave to the future problem of western power, and its effect on the original states, clarified the perplexities which had excited in the convention the apprehensions of Gerry and others. The influence which the new outlook had upon the different members was naturally in accordance with their individual habits of mind."

Then follow quotations from the speeches of Morris and Mason with regard to the rights and privileges of western states, and the inference is that the advocates of western rights derived their strength in some degree from the provisions of the Ordinance. But Mr. Winsor here overlooks the fact which he had already shown, that the essential principles of the federal territorial system had been early stated, and that they had been formulated in a way even more conservative of the power of western states in the ordinance of 1784. Moreover, the most critical debate in the Convention over the new western states was that in which the question of the congressional representation of new states as compared with the original states was agitated. In that debate the views of Mason and of Morris were clearly presented as early as July 5, and again on July 11. The publication of the ordinance noted by Mr. Winsor on the 25th of the same month could therefore have had no influence on the attitude of these speakers, and the votes on July 5 and July 14 showed that the Convention was not disposed to deprive the western people of their equal rights. It will be remembered that the ordinance was not reported in Congress, sitting in New York, until July 11, and that it was adopted July 13. The journey between these cities at that time took about two days, so that it is improbable that the ordinance had any effect on the vote of the Convention on representation, even if it were sent as soon as reported, instead of being made known by the publication above mentioned. The vote in the Convention following the speech of Mason quoted by the author was one on August 29, by which a clause providing that "new states shall be admitted on the same terms with the original states" was stricken out. So if the ordinance had an effect on the Convention, it would seem to have been opposite to the interests of the West.

When an author has covered so wide a range with such minuteness as has Mr. Winsor, it will perhaps seem improper to object that he has made little or no use, so far as the book gives evidence, of manuscript material in the archives particularly of France and Spain, upon important diplomatic relations between those countries and the United States in respect to the West. Mr. Winsor shows the dangers of this neglect, however, in his treatment of such an important subject as the effort of the French government to secure Louisiana and the Floridas in the period of Genet's mission. As the recent reports of the American Historical Manuscripts Commission show, there is an abundance of material to explain the aims and the detailed plans of the French and the Spaniards in the archives of those countries; but Mr. Winsor contents himself with using a few of the secondary authorities, and he quotes, with evident regret at its meagre information, the journal of Michaux, which furnishes hardly more than an itinerary, valuable chiefly in its relation to the French archives and to the Draper collection of George Rogers Clark papers. It is hard to understand why such a student as Mr. Winsor should content himself with a regret over the paucity of information on such a subject when the whole wealth of these archives was open to him,

and it is a striking illustration of the strange neglect of archives by the recent American historians.

Space makes it impossible to speak of the contributions of the author to the many other topics that lie within the compass of the work. There is no one of them on which he has not added information, diligently sought in many books of printed collections. His information is comprehensive and exact, as a rule, and if the present reviewer has rather pointed out minor defects than dwelt upon the great merit of the book as a whole, it is because it is difficult to praise such a work in other than general terms. When all minor criticisms on detail have been made—and in a work so abounding in statements of fact it is remarkable how few such criticisms must be—the book remains a splendid proof of the immense research of its author, of his skill and fairness in dealing with a multiplicity of detail, and of the continental breadth of his view. To have edited the *Narrative and Critical History of America*, and to have followed that by the series that begins with Columbus and ends with the *Westward Movement*, is to have established his ability in so wide a range of fields, requiring such stores of knowledge, and such a diversity of historical equipment that Winsor cannot but be granted a position among the first of American historians.

FREDERICK J. TURNER.

*Contemporary American Opinion of the French Revolution.* By CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN, Ph.D., Professor of History, Smith College. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Extra Vol. XVI.] (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1897. Pp. x, 315.)

MR. HAZEN'S book is naturally a compilation, but it is a successful one. He judiciously divides his subject into two parts: I. The Opinions of Americans Abroad; II. The Opinions of Americans at Home. In the first, he presents the views of Thomas Jefferson, Gouverneur Morris, and James Monroe, who were successively our representatives in France. Of these three chapters, those on Jefferson and Morris are the most important, for Monroe did not reach France until after the Thermidor, and, moreover, the nature of his tenets disqualified him for the rôle of a dispassionate critic.

Mr. Hazen has ably depicted Jefferson's attitude toward the French Revolution, and has shown the historical inutility of his much-quoted *Autobiography* by comparing it with his letters. The memoranda given of Jefferson's tour through France in 1787 are instructive. Until recent years, our knowledge of pre-revolutionary rural France has been derived largely from the *Travels* of that observing agriculturist, Arthur Young. Jefferson, however, throws a little light upon a subject lately illumined by Champion in his *La France d'après les Cahiers de 1789*. The picture given by the American minister is by no means joyous, but it is far from terrible. In 1789, Jefferson sailed for home, believing that the French Revolution was practically over.